10/608,003
PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

FILE COPY

To:
ELIZABETH ARWINE
OFFICE OF THE STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE U.S. ARMY
MEDICAL RESEARCH AND MATERIEL COMMAND
ATT:MCMR-JA
504 SCOTT STREET
FORT DETRICK, MD 21702-5012

ELIZABETH ARWINE OFFICE OF THE STAFF JUDGE ADVOCATE U.S. ARMY MEDICAL RESEARCH AND MATERIEL COMMAND ATT:MCMR-JA 504 SCOTT STREET FORT DETRICK, MD 21702-5012		PCT WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66)		
		Date of Mailing (day/month/year)		7
Applicant's or agent's file reference CHPPM02-401P		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing		
International application No.	International filing date ((day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
PCT/US03/20832	30 June 2003 (30.06.200	03)	28 June 2002 (28.06.2002)	
International Patent Classification (IPC)	or both national classificat	ion and IPC]
IPC(7): B04B 5/02, 9/00 and US Cl.: 49	4/16, 84			
Applicant				1
U.S. GOVERNMENT BY THE SECRE	TARY OF THE ARMY			
This written opinion is the <u>fir</u>	st (first, etc,) drawn by t	his International Pro	eliminary Examining Authority.	
2. This opinion contains indicati	ons relating to the following	ng items:		
I Basis of the opinion	on			
II Priority				
	t of oninion with regard to	novelty inventive	step and industrial applicability	
	_	Hovery, mvenuve	step and industrial applicationity	
IV Lack of unity of i				
	V Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
VI Certain document	s cited			
VII Certain defects in	the international application	on		
VIII Certain observation				
The applicant is hereby invit	ed to reply to this opinion	l .		
When? See the time				
	g a written reply, accompar and the language of the an		riate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. es 66.8 and 66.9.	
For the exam	For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.			
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6 If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.				
The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 28 October 2004 (28.10.2004) .				
N. C. DELGE				
Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US		Authorized office	arlls (s)	
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450		Charles E. Coole	y	+
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230		Telephone No. (571) 272-1700		

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

9 April 2004

International application No.

PCT/US03/20832

FILE COPY

I. Basis of the opinion	
1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*	
the international application as originally filed the description: pages 1-9, as originally filed pages NONE, filed with the demand pages NONE, filed with the letter of	
the claims: pages 10-13 , as originally filed pages NONE , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19 pages NONE , filed with the demand pages NONE , filed with the letter of	
the drawings: pages 1-6 , as originally filed pages NONE , filed with the demand pages NONE , filed with the letter of	
the sequence listing part of the description: pages NONE, as originally filed pages NONE, filed with the demand pages NONE, filed with the letter of	
 With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Au language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language 	n.
the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule23. the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)). the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination 55.2 and/or 55.3).	
3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:	ion, the written
contained in the international application in printed form. filed together with the international application in computer readable form. furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form. furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form. The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the	e disclosure in the
international application as filed has been furnished. The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the writ has been furnished.	ten sequence listing
4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of: the description, pages NONE the claims, Nos. NONE	
the drawings, sheets/fig NONE This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been completely beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).	considered to go
* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article this opinion as "originally filed."	: 14 are referred to in

International application No.
PCT/US03/20832 FILE COPY

V.	Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
İ	citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims	3-5, 7-11, 13-18, 20-21, 23-28	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 6, 12, 19, 22	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims	3-5, 7-11, 13-18, 20-21, 23-28	YES
	Claims	1, 2, 6, 12, 19, 22	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims	1-28	YES
	Claims	NONE	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1, 2, 6, 12, 19, and 22 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Wetherill (US 780,315).

The patent to Wetherill discloses a device including a centrifuge body a; holder or sling h; tether c3; handle c'; the device being formed in part of aluminum (page 2, lines 107-108); the device increasing centrifugal force on a specimen in the holder h by rotation about an axis (page 2, line 1-15).

Claim 22 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Lomb (US 3,233,825).

The patent to Lomb discloses means 4 for holding a specimen 14; means 9 for increasing centrifugal force on the specimen; and means 10 for providing a rotation axis.

Claim 22 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Talley (US 3,268,160).

The patent to Talley discloses means 10 for holding a specimen 11; means 24 for increasing centrifugal force on the specimen; and means 23 for providing a rotation axis.

Claim 22 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Brimhall et al. (US 4,738,655).

The patent to Brimhall et al. discloses means 26 for holding a specimen 28; means 24 for increasing centrifugal force on the specimen; and means (the member connecting 24 to 26) for providing a rotation axis.

Claims 3-5, 7-11, 13-18, 20-21, and 23-28 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the recited T-bar, cavity to hold the pull handle, brake, spring mechanism, or recited number of apertures.

Claims 1-28 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus possess industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry such as in the centrifugation of samples.

International application No.
PCT/US03/20832 FILE COPY

VП.	Certain defects in t	the international a	pplication			
The fo	ollowing defects in t	he form or content	s of the internation	onal application h	ave been noted:	
Claim	s 25 and 26 are objects	ed to under PCT Rule	e 66.2(a)(iii) as con	taining the following	ng defect(s) in the for	m or contents thereof:
	Claim 25 depends	from itself.				
	Claim 26 depends	from itself.				

International application No.
PCT/US03/20832

FILE COPY

VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claim 11 is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity under PCT Article 6 because it is indefinite for the following reason(s):

Claim 11: "said open back end" lacks antecedent basis. It appears this claim should depend from claim 4.

International application No. PCT/US03/20832

FILE COPY

Supplemental Box To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)			
TIME LIMIT: The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.			